PA-0219 file folder 1.006 le

151296

ORIGINAL (RED)

Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Transmission and Distribution

651 Holiday Drive
Pittsburgh Pennsylvania 15220

February 13, 1985

RECEIVED
FEB 14 1985
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES
Meadville Regional Office

Mr. Peter A. Yeager
Regional Water Quality Manager
Bureau of Water Quality Management
1012 Water Street
Meadville, PA 16335

RE: COAL-CRUSHER SUMP INCIDENT AT SHARON PLANT

Dear Mr. Yeager:

On November 8, 1984, a few globules of a heavier-than-water material were observed in the moat near the powerhouse at our Sharon plant. In response, Westinghouse took the following sequential actions:

1. The unidentified material was recovered from the moat.

2. The source of the material was traced to a discharge from the powerhouse which included three intermittent flows: one from the boiler-room sump, one from the coal-crusher sump, and one from the fly-ash settler.

3. The discharges from the two sumps were discontinued; the discharge from the fly-ash settler was not discontinued inasmuch as it involved the use of city water only.

4. The material was identified as Aroclor 1254.

Then, on November 9, 1984, the source of the heavy material was traced to the coal-crusher sump in the powerhouse. Also, late the same day, O.H. Materials arrived at the plant site to recover the Aroclor 1254 from the sump.

O.H. Materials began its operations early in the morning on November 10, 1984, and completed its demobilization on January 30, 1985. During this period, a total of 104 gallons of Aroclor 1254 was recovered, and a total of 260,380 gallons of water was processed. Arrangements have been made to ship the Aroclor 1254 to SCA for incineration, and the processed water was discharged to enter the Shenango River downstream of the intake of the Shenango Valley Water Company.

ORIGINAL (RED)

Seven batches of processed water were discharged after test results showed the PCB concentrations to be less than one part per billion. The authorizations for the temporary discharge of this water were granted as follows: until November 30, 1984, in your letter of November 20, 1984; until January 15, 1985, in Mr. Ralph's letter of December 6, 1984; and until January 31, 1985, as noted in Mr. Ralph's internal memorandum of January 16, 1985.

Attached are copies of eight analytical reports by the O.H. Materials laboratory. These reports pertain to the PCB concentrations in eight water samples which were taken from the seven batches of processed water prior to discharge; the eighth report pertains to the seventh batch of processed water after a second treatment through carbon. Also attached is a tabulated summary of the weekly reports that pertain to the water collected, the water processed, the water discharged, and the Aroclor 1254 recovered. The information in this summary is a confirmation of the periodic telephone reports that were made to Mr. Ralph as the job progressed.

In conclusion, the current status of the incident may be summarized by stating that nothing was found to determine and/or explain either the original source of the Aroclor 1254 or its route of entry into the coal-crusher sump. None of our investigations, drawing searches, sump inspections, site observations, or infiltration checks produced any clues for further investigation.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. Hair

R. A. Hair, Director
Production Resources

RAH:pm

Enclosures (9)

cc: Mr. Dwight G. Ralph, DER, Meadville